

3  
A CHAPTER IN CRITICISM.

PRACTICAL CHEMISTS

AND

THERAPEUTICAL CRITICS.

*H. B. Condy*

*"Nemo me impune lacessit."*

LONDON:  
ROBERT HARDWICKE, 192, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCLXXI.

LONDON :  
WYMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,  
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

## PREFACE.

---

"**D**RUGGISTS' CHARGES" have of late become a fertile subject of complaint on the part of certain medical newspaper correspondents. It has been pretended that the prices at which pharmacutists dispense medicine are in many cases beyond the reach of people of moderate means, and calculations as to the profits realized from dispensing prescriptions have been made, based on the commercial cost of the substances used in compounding them. Taking no account of the time and outlay of money incurred by chemists in completing their education, which, owing to the recent course of legislation affecting the pharmaceutical profession, have year by year been augmenting, the complainants in question have been in the habit of regarding the operation of dispensing medicines as if it in no respect differed from the retailing of ham or cheese. Those who have committed this egregious mistake have been so one-sided in their views as to forget that all the recent advances made by the medical profession towards a higher standard of education and uniformity of qualification have been in a direction which has naturally led to an increase of the consultation fees charged by the general practitioner. In illustration, as it were, of the truth of the proverb, *l'appétit vient en mangeant*, a goodly number of medical men have latterly brought forward the further complaint of "abuse of medical charities" and "indiscriminate use of dispensary tickets," on the score that many persons who can afford to pay for advice go for treatment to those institutions. Although the state of things thus found fault with is quite as detrimental to the pecuniary interests of chemists as to those of medical men, the former, so far as we

are aware, have not publicly complained of it. This, it must be admitted, goes to prove that pharmacutists, notwithstanding that they are, by the nature of their calling, traders, are not more mercenary than strictly professional men.

Going beyond the complaint against "chemists' charges" for prescriptions, in respect to which medical men, in their character of prescribers, may be allowed to have some right to speak, a London physician who conducts a therapeutical periodical has thought proper to find fault with the prices of proprietary preparations, for interfering with which he has not a tittle of excuse. In so doing he has adopted the same erroneous criterion as in the case of the complaint against "druggists' charges;" namely, the commercial cost of the ingredients which enter into the composition of the article. With the object of putting pharmacutists on their guard against this new form of interference on the part of some members of that profession, which ought to go hand in hand with their own, and at the same time of exhibiting the danger of disregarding the maxim *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, we have filled up a few spare moments by laying before them in print the correspondence to which the proceedings in question have, in one instance, given rise. By way of introduction to the letters which have been interchanged, we beg to add a paragraph from an influential trade journal, which has judged as they deserved the performances of *The Practitioner*.

### MEDDLESOME NEWSPAPERS.

Both manufacturers and retail tradesmen are aware of how the system of impudent meddling with their affairs, introduced by quack analyst adventurers, and taken up by the newspapers of the day, was growing into an enormous evil, until *The Grocer* made it one of its constant duties to expose the impure motives of the alarmists. These gentlemen, until the check was put upon their operations, were making a good thing of the cry of "adulteration" which they raised and made popular, and even at this time there are too many adventurers in the field who now and then succeed in getting up a sensation for the public to feed upon. But a new system of torture has lately been introduced, the credit of which belongs to some writer in a periodical called *The Practitioner*. This gentleman, swelling with philanthropic motives, conceives it his duty to analyze specimens of Mr. CONDY'S

well known preparations, estimating the original cost of the raw material used in the manufacture, and drawing a summary comparison between it and the price charged for the finished article as sold to the public. What an exquisite cool individual must be this self-appointed critic of Mr. CONDY'S profits. "We reasonstrated with him," says he. "for maintaining so high a price for these fluids in proportion to the intrinsic cost of the raw materials." In the name of all the analysts who are attending to other people's business instead of their own, by what law or right, moral or legal, does this writer consider himself authorized to put a touch of remonstrance against Mr. CONDY for conducting his business after his own desires? This involved, self, by hook and crook, though he has made himself acquainted with the business secrets of Mr. CONDY'S business, and dictated so easily to him on the subject of profit he ought to be satisfied with, but he had to pay this profit to Mr. CONDY, but he has no right to attack him upon the subject, and should remember that he has been guilty of a gross breach of professional etiquette in making public that which is Mr. CONDY'S trade mystery. The writer may have kept on the windy side of the law this time, but a repetition of his experiments might lead to results little expected, however desired. — *7th Decr., Dec. 2, 1870.*

We have been pained, though not altogether disappointed, to observe that the *Pharmaceutical Journal*, which ought to be conversant both with the ethics of the pharmaceutical profession and the technical chemistry of all substances and preparations connected with the Pharmacopœia, has, with considerable warmth, and as we venture to think will yet be apparent to its conductors, with too much haste, on two occasions, set apart a large portion of its crowded pages to intimate its approval and sanction of *The Practitioner's* proceedings. For the sake of its reputation for the commonest fair play, we should be sorry to think that that approval was given without due consideration of the case; but, for the sake of its scientific reputation, we should be still more grieved to think that the analysts of the official journal of pharmacy in this country had acted so carelessly and imbecilely as to obtain results identical in imaginative error with those they pretended to judge of.

" M. Condé signale une foule de circonstances dans lesquelles sa Liqueur peut rendre les plus grands services. Jouissant à un très-haut degré de la propriété de modifier et même de détruire les matières organiques, et spécialement celles qui sont en voie de décomposition ou de fermentation, quelles ressources ne doit-elle pas offrir pour le traitement des plaies et des ulcères, pour les déterger, les assainir, les modifier, pour prévenir ou arrêter les effets de la contagion, pour combattre les affections diphthériques, pour modifier ou détruire les productions anormales, les sécrétions nuisibles et même certaines substances vénéneuses dans les organes digestifs ?"—M. BOUDET, at Meeting of the IMPERIAL ACADEMY OF MEDICINE OF PARIS, Sept., 17, 1861, *Bull. Acad. Imp. Méd.*, t. xxvi., p. 1267.

"A WELL-DESERVED HONOUR.—The International Conference of Societies for Aid to the Wounded in War have awarded to Mr. Condé, of Battersea, their medal, in recognition of the importance to military surgery and great sanitary value of Condé's Fluid, as proved by the experience of the Prussian army surgeons."—*Lancet*, Dec. 7th, 1867.

# A CHAPTER IN CRITICISM.

PRACTICAL CHEMISTS

173

THERAPEUTICAL CRITICS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER," A JOURNAL  
OF THERAPEUTICS.

SIR,

My attention has just been directed to the article, entitled "Condy's Patent Fluids," which appeared, under the heading of "Department of New Inventions," in your number for August last, and to the apparent tone of detraction in which it is written. Permit me a few words of reply.

You say:—"The merit of introducing these salts (manganates and permanganates) 'to the general public,' as most valuable deodorizers and purifiers, belongs, 'we believe,' to Mr. Condy." Now this merit is only a small fraction of what may fairly be considered due to me in connection with the discovery of the sanitary properties of those substances. I was the first to introduce them as hygienic agents, not only to the general public, but also to the scientific world, as you will find admitted in most English modern standard works on systematic chemistry. When such men as Hofmann, Liebig, Thomson, Brande, Playfair, and a host of other eminent authorities have unreservedly

Condy's preparations have been before the public fully a dozen years.



recognized my exclusive claim to the discovery of those properties, you might have stated the fact without qualification.

You go on to say:—"But though the initiative in establishing their manufacture on the large scale belongs to Mr. Condry, he seems to have allowed himself to be outstripped in their economical production. In the following table will be found the strength of three kinds of Condry's Patent Fluids as sold in London, measured by their oxidizing power in comparison to pure permanganate of potash." The table in question seems to me, however, utterly to fail in proving that I have allowed myself to be outstripped in economical production. It shows, indeed, that the selling price of Condry's Fluid is somewhat higher, in two of the kinds, than that of the equivalent quantity of its active ingredient. But surely this is nothing unprecedented. On the contrary, it is the necessary rule in such cases, as every chemist and druggist knows. Is even the *Liquor Potassæ Permanganatis* of the *Pharmacopœia*, which is, of course, unburdened with the heavy charges \* that fall on proprietary articles, dispensed per ounce at the price of the four grains of permanganate of potash therein contained? On the contrary, threepence per ounce is very commonly charged for it, and sometimes even as much as sixpence. Is it not the case that all proprietary disinfecting preparations are sold at rates greatly in excess of the value of the quantity of the active ingredients in them? Would not, for instance, the selling prices of McDougall's Powder and some of Calvert's Disinfecting preparations have to be very much reduced if they were to be conformed to that of the quantity of carbolic acid which they respectively contain? † And, after all, what is the excess in price of Condry's Fluid which your table

---

\* Such as outlay for bills, showcards, and a mass of special and occasional printing, travelling or representation expenses—extremely heavy on a single article, and, above all, costs of advertising, which, with the present multiplicity of periodicals, are enormous.

† The prices of carbolic acid disinfectants would have to be still further reduced if the quantities of them required to be used were to



exhibits? It is thereby shown that in purchasing Condyl's Fluid (Crimson) 3s. 6d. is paid for the same quantity of permanganate contained in it which can be bought by the ounce for 2s. This is an excess of 75 per cent. It shows, however, too, that in purchasing Condyl's Fluid (Green)—the more popular form—1s. 9d. only is paid, which is actually considerably under the price of the equivalent quantity of permanganate in the dry state.

Were the results of the comparison even much less favourable to Condyl's Fluid in the matter of price, I should still be unable to see in what respect that would prove that I have been outstripped in economical production. The very article of permanganate of potash, with which you compared the Fluid, was probably of my manufacture; for a very large proportion of all the permanganate in the market is of my make. Not only so, but the price at which it was sold by me wholesale was, in all likelihood, fifty per cent. under that at which you have set it down. How, then, can it be said that I have been outstripped? On the contrary, I was not only the first to manufacture permanganates for sale as such on the large scale, but have been the means of reducing their price from that of chemical curiosities to what it now is. I do not think, moreover, that I am at the present time undersold by any house in the trade in those articles when they are taken in really large quantities.

When I reflect on the time I have devoted to the study of the permanganates in all their various forms, and to the labour and expenditure that have been necessary to secure

---

is taken into account. A writer in *The Sanitary Record* has drawn the following instructive comparison between the practical cost of carbolic acid and Condyl's Fluid, based on the prices and directions which are to be found on the label of each:—

	Price.	Quantity produced when diluted for use.	Cost of dilution.
Condyl's Fluid	1s. per pint	80 quarts	1d. p. gal.
Colvert's Carbolic Acid	1s. 6d. per lb.	20 quarts	3d. p. gal.

their consumption in this country, it would seem to me almost a matter of wonder that I have been able, even partially, to accomplish my objects with the scale of prices fixed by me for Condyl's Fluid. But for the small measure of success which has attended my efforts, this would have been impossible. On comparing the extent to which the uses of the permanganates are availed of in England and the colonies with that which obtains in foreign countries, where those salts have not given rise to any proprietary preparations, this will be apparent. Whereas here those substances have come into very general consumption, on the Continent and in America they are yet hardly known, except to a very limited number of persons. The remarkable difference that exists in this respect is evidently to be attributed to the position which my special preparations, by reason of my exertions, have at length made for themselves. The appreciation of Condyl's Fluid by the British public, and its consequent sale at the prices established by me, have been the means of enabling me to effect this object, which is yet very far from having been accomplished in other countries, because no one in them has taken on himself the risk and trouble attendant on the introduction of the permanganates, and their popularization as disinfectants. The advantage is clearly in favour of the public here, and that advantage is the exclusive result of my labours and my prices.

Permit me, in conclusion, to state that your report is altogether at fault in respect to the composition of Condyl's Ozonised Water (your No. III.), "in which," you say, "the active agent is chiefly permanganate of soda with some potash." So far from this being the case, no soda whatever, and only an unimportant residual quantity of potash, exist in that preparation, which is a solution of an entirely different salt, hitherto made for sale only by me, and having, moreover, properties (one of which is comparative tastelessness) possessed by no other permanganate with which I am acquainted; and I think there are few with which I am not familiar. You have, moreover, no warrant for classing the preparation in question

as Condyl's Fluid; it has never been so designated by me, and instead of being an ordinary disinfecting preparation like the fluid, it belongs to the class of toilet articles, and with such only can it be fairly compared in the matter of price.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTERSEA, 21st September, 1870.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER."

SIR,

Too great length, according to you, in the communication which I addressed to you on the subject of your unwarranted, uninformed, and inaccurate statement in connection with my manufactures, having been made by you a pretext for substituting in its place in the pages of your journal, where, if you had any sense of fairness, it would have appeared, a *surrogate* editorial one, reiterating your false assumptions, and the latter manifesting no intention of stating things fairly,—I will, in this letter, avoid complex questions, such as the principles which regulate the prices of proprietary preparations like mine, concerning which you are entirely in the dark, not knowing how to distinguish between gross and net profits, and confine myself, if possible, to one matter of fact.

In reference to your aggressive article, I wrote to you, among other things, as follows:—"Permit me, in conclusion, to state that your report is altogether at fault in respect to the composition of Condyl's Ozonised Water, into which no soda

You replied thus:—"In answer to this we have to remark that the examination was made by one of the first analysts of this country, and we are therefore disinclined to attach any very great importance to Mr. Condyl's hints about some previously quite

whatever, and only an unimportant residual quantity of potash enter. That preparation is a solution of an entirely different salt, which has never been made for sale but by me, and which, moreover, has properties (one of which is comparative tastelessness) possessed by no other permanganate with which I am acquainted."

unknown permanganate" [in other phraseology, to Mr. Condy's word].

Now, Sir, with these two statements in juxtaposition before you to refresh your memory, will you oblige me with unequivocal answers to the following questions:—

1. Do you know, of your own knowledge, that one of the first analysts in this country did really analytically examine and report to you upon Condy's Ozonised Water?
2. Are you prepared to produce the report of the said analyst when called upon so to do?
3. Are you willing to give up his name?

Yours obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTERSEA, 15th November, 1870.

P.S.—I cannot bring myself to pass over without comment one other point. In reply to my argument, in favour of the prices of Condy's Fluid, that they have been fixed in accordance with the principles which regulate the prices of proprietary articles in general, you say, "Mr. Condy maintains that a trader has a right to make what profits he can." Now I did not say this, nor could it have occurred to me to say anything so puerile. The rights of traders were not in discussion. What I did maintain was that Condy's Fluid, in so far as it is sold at a good margin of gross profit, was no exception among proprietary articles, supposing, as

I was justified in doing, it would be understood that some other reason, derived from trade exigencies, beyond mere "right" or will, was the cause of the universal prevalence of this system. You continue: "We had paid Mr. Condy the compliment of presuming that his views were not altogether those of a mere trader; the claims to scientific discovery which he put forward led us to believe in his patriotic intention to bring a valuable sanitary discovery within the reach of the poor, and of public health authorities, who might require to use it on a large scale. We beg his pardon if we are mistaken." If the compliment of supposing me to be "patriotic" and charitable had been paid to me as a private individual, and founded on a knowledge of my character instead of being "presumed" from my claims as a discoverer, it might have been considered acceptable. But such a compliment, if deserved by me in my capacity of manufacturer and trader, would be the very reverse of flattering, since it would prove that I was no man of business. I am glad to think that it is perhaps undeserved, and to believe, moreover, that probably no one with whom I am in the habit of transacting business would be of a different opinion.

It displays rare confusion of thought to class together the poor who have not the means of paying and the public health authorities, who have the whole body of ratepayers behind them. To be benefited, the poor, who cannot afford to purchase, must be supplied gratuitously; the reduction of selling prices generally would, consequently, be hardly any advantage to them. To the extent of my ability, as hundreds of clergymen and chemists throughout the country can testify, I have attempted to provide gratuitous supplies of Condy's Fluid to necessitous persons: but my ability in this respect would be completely destroyed by a general lowering of prices to the level of the paying power of the poor.



16, WIMPOLE STREET,

November 16th.

SIR,

I HAVE received your letter of the 15th inst., in which you ask me to state "unequivocally" whether I have spoken the truth, and whether I know what I am about.

Perhaps these queries were hardly judicious. But as I have no unkind feeling towards yourself, I shall make no further comments on their style and taste. Here are my answers:—

1. I did employ an analyst of first-rate reputation to examine your preparations: he is the same gentleman who is regularly retained for the analysis of every chemical article criticised in *The Practitioner*.

2. The full report of this gentleman upon the Ozonised Water can certainly be produced whenever I find it advisable to do so.

3. With reference to the name of my analyst, I should personally have not the slightest objection to your knowing it, and I will consult him on the matter. You must be quite aware, however, that it is not the usual etiquette of editors to give up the names of the authors of scientific reports. It is enough if they or their publishers are prepared to take the responsibility upon themselves.

I may mention, by the way, that since your last letter to me I have caused the Ozonised Water to be examined for a second time.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

FRANCIS E. ANSTIE.

H. BOLLMANN CONDY, Esq.

---

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER."

SIR,

IT was very far from my object, in addressing you in the terms wherein I did, to be in the smallest degree offen-

sive or disrespectful to you. The style of my letter was, after a sort, imposed upon me by that which you had previously adopted. It seemed to me best, in corresponding with you, to employ your own manner. You do not relish it even in my hitherto unpublished letter;—why should I be expected to like it in a published communication? When, in answer to my distinct statement that neither soda nor potash enters into the composition of Condry's Ozonised Water—a fact of which I could not but be certain—you said you were disinclined to attach any very great importance to my hints (in other phraseology, to my word), did you expect me to be pleased?

I consider your reply to my first question to be ambiguous. If you will refer again to that question, and compare therewith your answer, you will, I think, agree with me.

You say that since my last letter you have ordered a second analysis of Condry's Ozonised Water. It would have been more to the purpose had you done so after my first communication. You will now find, when your analyst comes to make a serious analysis, that I am right, and that you are wrong. When this shall have proved to be the case, it is a matter appertaining to your own province, and which you and your analyst may be presumed to understand, you will perhaps begin to have a glimmering of doubt as to your competence to discuss the commercial principles on which my business is conducted.

Yours obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTLSEA, 16th Nov., 1870.

---

16, WIMTOLE STREET,

November 18th.

SIR,

To end all "ambiguity" whatever respecting the analysis of, and report on, your preparations in *The Prac-*



*titioner*, I beg to inform you, though I do not wish the fact generally published, that my analyst was Dr. A. D \* \*, Lecturer on Chemistry at \* \* \* \*, and author, as I dare say you know, of some of the most remarkable analyses of wines—among many other things—that have ever been made. I suppose a more accomplished analyst does not live.

Once more I have to remark that we are perfectly acquainted with the ingredients of your preparations, and

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

FRANCIS E. ANSTIE.

H. BOLLMANN CONDY, Esq.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER."

SIR,

I HAVE too good an opinion of the proficiency of Dr. D \* \* as a chemist to believe that he has found, by actual examination, either soda or potash in CondY's Ozonised Water. If he conducts his analysis on the right method, he will find that preparation to consist of a solution of permanganate of lime; if not, the fault must lie in the method employed by him,

Yours obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTLESEA, 22<sup>nd</sup> Nov., 1870.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER."

SIR,

IN the last letter with which you favoured me, you stated that you had instructed your analyst to make a fresh examination of CondY's Ozonised Water. Will you

is good enough to inform me in what (if anything) the new report differs from the previous one?

On my part, I have so far deferred to the reputation of Dr. D \* \* as to have caused to be made for me a quantitative analysis of the preparation in question, although that step was evidently superfluous in respect to an article of my own make, of whose composition I could not but be certain. The report I have received bears me out in my statements on the subject of our controversy, and I believe that it is one that would be confirmed by reference to any neutral good authority.

Fortified by that report, I venture to re-assert that your published analysis of Condry's Ozonised Water is erroneous. I have, therefore, to beg you to favour me with the quantitative particulars, if not the method, of your analyst's examination of that preparation. No well-intentioned journalist, in the position in which you find yourself, could well object to my request in favour of a measure which is calculated to determine on which side lies the truth.

Your obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTERSEA, 24th Jan., 1871.

16, WIMPOLE STREET,

January 27th.

SIR,

BEFORE writing this answer to your letter of the 14th inst., I have taken time to refresh my memory concerning the whole of the facts in dispute respecting "Condry's Fluid." I must now beg you to understand that this letter closes the correspondence on my part.

Two analyses of the "Ozonised Water" were made for me by Dr. D \* \*, one before, and one after, the publication of my first report. Each of these analyses showed indisputably that the Fluid, so far from being a simple permanganate, contained a mixture of several different salts. The second

analysis (made upon a fresh sample) showed, however, a greater preponderance of one particular element—permanganate of lime—than was found in the sample analyzed previously to the publication of our report.\* Both the first and the second samples, however, were complex fluids, composed of inexpensive materials, and distinctly inferior in oxidizing power to pure permanganate of potash.

Thus much, Sir, I am willing to communicate to you. But I am quite unable to see the justice or propriety of my embarking in a controversy with your analyst, to be decided by a "neutral" chemist. You are at perfect liberty, of course, to publish any vindication of your processes which you can produce; I, on the part of *The Practitioner*, have simply to maintain the strict accuracy of the report in that journal for August last. There was more soda than lime in the specimen which formed the basis of that report, and which was obtained from an undoubted source; this is distinctly averred in Dr. D \* \* 's report to me; and I need hardly say that on such a question I receive his word as final, he being quite impartial in the matter, and the question being by no means difficult for so expert an analyst to decide.

In reviewing the whole controversy, I must take occasion to remark that I have stretched courtesy towards yourself to its very limits. Nothing could have been less offensive than the manner of our original report, whereas it would have been easy, and justifiable, to have spoken in severe terms of the use of the title "Ozonised Water." You, on your part, have cast the most unmannerly imputations on our good faith and truthfulness. That is a matter of very small consequence to me; but it is sufficient to make me decide to abstain entirely from further correspondence about this question.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

FRANCIS ED. ANSTIE.

H. BOLLMANN CONDY, Esq.

---

\* The analyses, not the samples, differed.

## TO THE EDITOR OF "THE PRACTITIONER."

SIR,

I BEG to acknowledge receipt of your favour of 27th January, in answer to mine of 24th, wherein, in connection with my reiterated complaint of the faultiness of your published analysis of Condry's Ozonised Water, I had requested you to furnish me with the quantitative particulars, if not the method, of your analyst's examination,\* to compare in detail with the analysis which I caused to be made. Your reply, in place of meeting this very natural request by a graceful compliance, or a plain refusal, avoids the point, and wanders into other matters.

I had charged you with erroneously stating that Condry's Ozonised Water is "chiefly composed of permanganate of soda with some potash," whereas, in reality, it is a solution of permanganate of lime. You have made answer that each of two analyses which had been made for you showed that the preparation in question, "so far from being a simple permanganate, contains a mixture of several different salts, but that the second analysis showed a greater preponderance of one particular element, permanganate of lime, than was found in the sample analyzed previously to the publication of the report." Considering that the first analysis showed no lime at all, this reads very like a disguised admission that the analysis on which you based your report contained the error with which I charged you. The question was not whether Condry's Ozonised Water was a chemically pure solution, but whether it was a solution of permanganate of lime or of entirely different salts. It is no longer doubtful that, until I informed you of the composition of my preparation, you were in ignorance that it contained lime, as your

---

\*The method by means of which large quantities of soda can be covered in compounds where it can be kept, would be well deserving of the most attentive study; and the quantitative details could be of much value for determining the exact amount of its success in this particular case. Perhaps, in the interest of science, the Editor of *The Practitioner* may yet relent, and comply with the request to publish them.

analyst also apparently was. It is therefore clear that your chemical adviser led you into an error, which you are unwilling frankly to admit.

It would hardly be possible for any chemist worthy of the name, who had bestowed any care on the examination of Condry's Ozonised Water, to describe it otherwise than as a solution of permanganate of lime. Your analyst, nevertheless, stated it to be "chiefly permanganate of soda, with some potash." He now informs you that Condry's Ozonised Water is "composed of inexpensive materials, and is distinctly inferior in oxidizing power to pure permanganate of potash." In so doing he exhibits his want of knowledge of the process for obtaining permanganate of lime, as well as of the constitution of that salt. Being produced through the pure potash salt, permanganate of lime is comparatively expensive, and having an atomic constitution richer in permanganic acid,\* it must also be a more powerful oxidizer than permanganate of potash. The lime salt being, moreover, less stable than the potash one, acts more rapidly, and, on account of its comparative tastelessness, can be used by fastidious persons, to whom the potash salt is repugnant. Such being the character of permanganate of lime, it is obvious that Condry's Ozonised Water cannot be inferior in oxidizing power to permanganate of potash (in equivalent solution), which is the least rich in oxygen of all the alkaline permanganates. Yet this is what you have permitted yourself unreflectingly to assert! But what else could be expected? It is a complete reversal of the means whereby information is usually acquired, for individuals unacquainted with some particular line of observation, to inaugurate their noviciate by undertaking to teach those who have for years made it their study.

---

\* Permanganate of lime contains eighty-three per cent. of permanganic acid, whereas permanganate of potash possesses only sixty-seven per cent. Their formulae, according to modern notation, are as follows:—

Permanganate of lime,  $\text{Ca}^2\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$ .

Permanganate of potash,  $\text{K}^2\text{Mn}_2\text{O}_8$ .



In having your criticism of the price at which I sell my product, on rates of gross profit, you showed that you had gone beyond your province. It was, perhaps, hardly to be expected of you to know that it is net profits that regulate prices in such cases. But it was to be supposed that you could speak with diffidence on a subject so foreign to your experience. Your confidence in that respect, however, is even more excusable than the error which you have committed in your own special walk.

In answer to your remark, that it would have been "easy and justifiable to speak in severe terms of the use of the title 'Ozonized Water,'" I would observe that it is not difficult to assume the language of severity in an organ of publicity which refuses the means of reply. Had you, on any neutral platform, ventured to indulge in severe strictures on the title 'Ozonized Water,' it would have been easy for me successfully to justify its use. There is, perhaps, no toilet article more accurately described by its title than Condé's Ozonized Water, whose active ingredient has, by the best authorities, been denominated an *Oxidant*. Your severity would, therefore, you see, have recoiled upon your own head.

You are good enough to say, "You are at perfect liberty to publish any vindication of your processes which you can produce." Permit me, in reply, to state that if I publish anything connected with this correspondence, the publication shall consist of something more than a vindication of my "processes."

This letter will be accompanied by a variety of Condé's fluid,\* from which you will be able to obtain a practical notion in the working of proprietary articles. Permanganate of potash, according to indisputable testimony, is a valuable remedial agent, and it is, as you pretend, now inexpensive. Nevertheless it is rarely used for curative purposes by the medical profession (although, in consequence of my efforts, it has been placed in the Pharmacopœia), and not at all by the public. Now, by spending money on pub-

---

\* Condé's Remedial Fluid."

licity I am about to cause it to be largely used by both. In order to render possible this outlay, which, for a considerable time, will be unproductive, I shall be obliged to sell my remedial preparation at full prices. The result will, however, be that I shall probably create a property, and at the same time teach the medical profession and the public the curative uses of the alkaline permanganates. This would not be possible by selling at a moderate gross profit, as you, from want of experience and reflection, had imagined. Here is a practical lesson on a subject closely connected with therapeutics, which cannot fail to be of use to you, and which I have no doubt will often come to your recollection as you advance in life.

Yours obediently,

H. B. CONDY.

BATTERSEA, *January 29th*, 1871.

---

“DR. DUPRÉ begs to refer Mr. Condy to the answers he has received from Dr. Anstie, which Dr. Dupré endorses in all their parts.”

LABORATORY, WESTMINSTER HOSPITAL.

(From the *Chemist and Druggist*, Feb. 15th, 1871.)

ANALYTICAL Chemistry is a comparatively modern pursuit, and its professors can only claim a reasonable right of existence under the conditions of civilized society. Adulteration is not practised among savages; and if it were the chemist who should be bold enough to expose the fraud would enjoy a fair prospect of being roasted in his own crucibles. The pursuit of science under such unpropitious circumstance as these is not tempting, and thus it comes to pass that neither among the noble savages of the present day nor, as far as we have any record, among the equally unamiable nations of antiquity was the profession of analytical chemistry carried on. But in England in the present generation a much milder form of courage is necessary to attack and expose the grocers, bakers, and confectioners, wine-dealers, and provision merchants generally, whose amusement seems to consist in gathering together all the poisonous refuse of creation for the purpose of rendering short and miserable the lives of their unhappy fellow creatures. It is generally supposed that for the exposure of such



practices the world owes a deep debt of gratitude to analytical  
 limits. So be it; it is not our purpose to dispute the claim. Let,  
 suppose a time shall come when all adulterations shall be dangerous  
 this; when robbery shall be so dangerous that it will be no longer  
 to practice it; and when poisoning, either by slow or prompt  
 means, will be so certain of detection as to spoil the whole interest  
 the experiment. Will not such a state of things be almost as bad  
 the analytical class as the primitive condition to which they have  
 referred? They must live; at least they will probably think  
 and it is to be feared that for them, as for Dr. Watts' little busy  
 Susan, will find some mischief and for their idle hands to do.

This may not occur in its fulness for another generation or two, but  
 meanwhile we have opportunity presented to ascertain the value of  
 it may be expected to happen when the project we have indicated  
 all be perfected. We direct attention to one instance which has  
 taken place recently. The *Pharmaceutical Journal* is a monthly medical magazine,  
 which aims to represent the highest class of the profession. It has  
 always been carried on this programme, partly by the high  
 class, and partly by getting responsible writers on medical. It is  
 not a perfect journal, but not always, and it is in fact very  
 much like the rest of us, a mixture of good, bad, and indifferent.  
 Its editor has recently resolved to keep an analytical; and having  
 decided his wish and motive, it became a matter of urgent necessity  
 provide him with some rich material. The analyst would doubtless  
 have preferred a more tender route, which was his natural feel-  
 ing, not being available at the present, it was thought advisable to  
 war rather tough honest man to him. "The red was that,"  
 I therefore the blood of the first man who came in the editor's path  
 I to be shed. The victim chanced to be Mr. H. B. Condy. With-  
 out making the smallest pretence of serving any good purpose  
 by the preparation of the permanent were published in  
 the *Pharmaceutical*, with comment on his business, which was  
 what out of place in a high-class professional journal. This  
 may be passed over, however, for the present. A more interesting  
 question at this stage now arises. The analyst (who, we after-  
 wards learn, was Dr. Dupré, a chemist of fair reputation)  
 stated that Condy's ozonised water was a solution of perman-  
 ent of potash with a little potassium to of soda; that it was in  
 fact, chemically the same as the red fluid. Mr. Condy wrote to the  
 editor, stating that his ozonised water was a solution of perman-  
 ent and herb salt, afterwards informing him of the exact composition,  
 only, that it was a solution of perman-  
 ent of lime. Several  
 tests were interchanged and shortly the whole of the correspond-  
 ence will be published. We can promise those of our readers who  
 want it a real treat. Speaking purely from a critical point of view,  
 there will be no difference of opinion, we think, as to where the  
 responsibility lies. Mr. Condy puts Dr. Anstie and his colleague into an un-  
 pleasant query. They stoutly maintain the correctness of the  
 analysis; but, wonderful to relate, on a second examination, made  
 after the composition of the ozonised water had been revealed to  
 them, they do find some lime in it. They account for this by sup-  
 posing that the samples have varied! Reluctantly the reader waves

in his faith in the infallibility of chemical analysts after this, and in this case is more inclined to trust the synthetical statement. There are many other points of interest in the correspondence, the perusal of which we are fiendish enough to admit has given us much enjoyment; but we must not detail any more at present, as we do not wish to spoil the charm of it when it comes before the world in its completeness.

All chemists and most medical men are well aware that by his investigations into the value of the permanganates as disinfectants and medicinal agents, Mr. Condry has well deserved the honourable scientific reputation which has been accorded to him. By business talent and energy, and by liberal expenditure afterwards, he has popularised his discoveries, and made the salts accessible to others. He is entitled to whatever rewards he may have gained, and at least might expect fair and polite treatment, most of all from physicians. We are bound to say—for the whole of the correspondence has been submitted to us—that from the editor of *The Practitioner* he has not received this.